

REMARKS

Claims 11-21 are pending in this application, of which claims 11 and 19 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 11-13, 17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Huang et al.** (previously applied) in view of **Chang** (previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Both cited references were discussed in detail in the response filed September 17, 2003. In that response, it was argued that neither of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests that each of the line conductors forms a micro-strip line in conjunction with the ground plate, as recited in claim 11.

In addition, the combination of the cited references teaches, at most, only one pad 72 on the most upper one of the interlayer insulation films, while the present invention has a plurality of pads arranged in series on the most upper one of the interlayer insulation films, adjacent to and along the periphery of the semiconductor substrate.

In each of Figs. 3, 5 and 6, only one pad 6 is shown adjacent to the periphery of a semiconductor substrate, where the semiconductor substrate is partially shown only in the area defined by a pair of meandering lines and adjacent to a straight line representing the periphery of the semiconductor substrate.

This depiction is used only for simplicity and it should be understood that the same pads exist in the area on the semiconductor substrate, which is not shown in the figures, as the pad

shown in the figures. In fact, in Fig. 7, a plurality of pads are arranged along the periphery of semiconductor substrate 100, which depicts the entire area thereof, as would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, claims 11 and 19 have been amended to recite this distinction, and the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Huang et al. in view of Chang, and further in view of Moritz (previously applied).

The Examiner has cited Moritz for teaching that the insulating film is made of polyamide or benzocyclobutene, but, like the other cited references, fails to teach, mention or suggest the limitations added to claim 11, from which claim 18 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 21 are allowed and the Examiner has indicated that claims 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully defer such an action until an Advisory Action, if any, is received. Furthermore, claim 20 should be allowed because it depends from allowed claim 16.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 11-21, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/084,919
Response to Office Action dated December 3, 2003

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks

William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla

Atty. Docket No. 020129

Suite 1000

1725 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE